

## Attachment B – Marymoor Subarea: Draft Responses to Commissioner’s Questions

		PROPOSED APPROACH	TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REPORT	Draft Responses
1.	Affordable Housing	<p>This question was responded to in the memo for the Commission’s 1/18/17 meeting.</p> <p>Propose continuing to answer as a question.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does 1300 figure referenced in staff presentation on affordable housing translate into actual units of affordable housing?</li> <li>How is this calculated?</li> </ul>	
2.	GENERAL COMMENT	INFRASTRUCTURE: Propose for issues matrix	<p>In many locations within the submitted materials, reference is made to correlating the implementation of needed public infrastructure to timing generated by “market forces”. The assertion appears to be that the timing of infrastructure development (including streets, sidewalks, utilities, surface water treatment, etc.) will only occur when “market forces” dictate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is this the first plan in the City to use this method to identify, prioritize, and phase development of public infrastructure?</li> <li>Which market forces specifically drive this determination?</li> <li>Failing a listing of these market forces in the Subarea Plan, who determines which market forces apply, and when?</li> <li>Does the undocumented list of market forces affecting the pace of infrastructure development include the opening of a Link light rail station in 2024?</li> </ul>	

## Attachment B – Marymoor Subarea: Draft Responses to Commissioner’s Questions

3.	8/10	<p>POLICY CONSISTENCY: Propose for issues matrix</p> <p>Staff may have responded to some of these questions in the issues matrix for the Commission’s 1/18/17 meeting.</p>	<p>Consistency with SE Redmond Plan N-SE-39 <u>Focus employment growth near light rail station</u>. “Focus residential growth near Marymoor Park Accommodate at least 700 new homes (units) in the subarea ...to offset reductions in residential capacity in the Northeast Subarea”</p> <p>N-SE-40 “<u>Incorporate housing into the Marymoor Subarea that is walkable to the station (but not as walkable as employment?)</u> Maintain opportunities for transit oriented development <u>that includes housing capacity in close proximity to the light rail station</u> and for housing capacity in the areas closest to Marymoor park”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does the proposed plan meet both goals concurrently?</li> <li>• What is the employment density per acre in the MDD?</li> <li>• What is the potential buildout density of residential in the MDD?</li> <li>• What is the potential employment within ¼ and ½ mile of the station</li> <li>• What is the potential residential population in that same area?</li> </ul>	
----	------	--	--	--

## Attachment B – Marymoor Subarea: Draft Responses to Commissioner’s Questions

4.	9/10	Propose answering this as a question.	<p>Comments on Heartland Study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The study assumes pro-rata internalization of all infrastructure costs, i.e. that parcels as they redevelop will pay a specific fee for public infrastructure improvements, and that these costs help drive the determination of whether redevelopment is fiscally justified.</li> <li>• Is that how we’re doing it downtown or in Overlake? Did new development pay (other than usual concurrency requirements) any Local Improvement District fee or dedicate a fee to accommodate improvements (for example) on Cleveland Street or 152<sup>nd</sup> Ave NE in Overlake?</li> <li>• How did Heartland calculate or present the economic opportunity represented by the introduction of high capacity transit to the planning area?</li> <li>• Heartland incorporates parking costs in their affordability assessment – how does uncoupling parking cost from the residential developments closest to LINK affect these calculations? (possibly move to another item on parking)</li> </ul>	<p>The funding approach for Marymoor and Overlake is similar: the development of new street grids will occur concurrent with private development. Downtown is different in that much of the street grid already existed when the latest wave of redevelopment began in the 1990s. Still, in Downtown most developers build frontage improvements to bring streets up to existing standards. Property owners have not paid development-related transportation fees beyond impact fees to contribute towards transportation improvements like Cleveland St.</p> <p>Heartland used rental comps in Downtown and the Overlake/Bel-Red areas to estimate rental revenue in the Marymoor Subarea. To the extent rental comps in those areas reflect the economic opportunity represented by the introduction of high capacity transit, the same opportunity is reflected for the Marymoor Subarea.</p> <p>Parking costs addressed as part of response to #15</p>
5.	9/10	INFRASTRUCTURE: Propose for issues matrix	<p>The question of impact of infrastructure development and timing on redevelopment is huge, and is only modestly addressed in the plan. Please discuss and present a prioritized approach to infrastructure development, keying on a 2024 Link opening.</p>	

## Attachment B – Marymoor Subarea: Draft Responses to Commissioner’s Questions

			EXHIBIT A : Recommended Comprehensive Plan Amendments	
6.	Page 7/9	Propose incorporating change to text.	Centers – The title should be changed to Urban and Local Centers to better reflect actual content of section	
7.	Page 8/9	This question was responded to in the issue matrix for Commission’s 1/18/17 meeting.	Local Centers What is the practical difference if this area is designated as a Local Center or not at all? Since the Local Center concept is not recognized by the PSRC or state, does not generate any funding or service grant eligibility, nor exemption from state or federal environmental requirements, one has to ask - what tangible advantage is gained here?	
8.	Page 9/9	Propose following up to clarify question.	MDD Designations – bullet one – does “provide a Walkable Area” imply that this is a value comprehensively applied in the entire MDD?	
9.		COMPLETE STREETS: Propose for issues matrix	Same question for reference to provision of a street grid that enhances walkability and connectivity. It’s a comprehensive value, right? (see Type II and III streets, P&R location) What is the relationship of the proposed infrastructure plan to the Redmond adopted Complete Streets policy?	
10.	Page 2/2	Propose incorporating change to text.	<del>Continue</del> Complete planning for the extension of Sound Transit’s East Link... This is a real thing now, existing language makes it sound like speculation that East Link would come to Redmond. This is an important distinction in developing plans based on what we KNOW will happen rather than what MIGHT happen. The future is speculative, but 2024 is not.	

## Attachment B – Marymoor Subarea: Draft Responses to Commissioner’s Questions

11.	Page 5/5	PARK & RIDE GARAGE: Propose for issues matrix	<p>Map N-SER-2 – There appears to be a conflict between the 2016 Subarea Infrastructure Plan and this map regarding the location of the 1400 stall regional parking garage. On this map, it is shown (appropriately) adjacent to the LRT station. It is shown in a different location in the infrastructure plan.</p> <p>Which is correct? Is there a city-preferred location for this immense 1400 stall parking facility identified in this plan?</p> <p>Where is the assertion of preference for location of the 1400 stall parking garage cited in the materials presented to the Planning Commission for review?</p>	
			EXHIBIT B: Recommended Functional Plan Amendments	
12.		INFRASTRUCTURE: Propose for issues matrix	<p><u>Need timeline on development of projects intended to “retro fit” long-standing deficiencies on existing streets in entire subarea.</u></p> <p>Is there an assessment of short term capital needs related to transportation infrastructure that is based on current deficiencies in the area?</p> <p>What are the timing goals and priorities among all these projects?</p>	

## Attachment B – Marymoor Subarea: Draft Responses to Commissioner’s Questions

13.	Page 2/5	Propose answering this as a question.	<p>Project 14.</p> <p>Is it within the scope of a Subarea Plan to modify plan descriptions and content of regional facilities? Elsewhere the Subarea Plan takes liberties in calling for removal of a Redmond Way overhead crossing, here the goal is removal of an underpass.</p> <p>If the goal is to call specifically for an overpass at 520/Redmond Way, great – shouldn’t this be done in the context of the citywide Transportation Master Plan, rather than snuck through the back door in a subarea plan seen and reviewed by a relatively small number of people?</p> <p>Why is there zero discussion of this in the materials presented for review? <b>MAJOR ISSUE</b></p>	Staff proposes removing the words “(SR 520 Undercrossing)” from the title of the E Lk Samm Trail extension because the overriding objective is to achieve a grade-separated crossing through the interchange. Sound Transit is now beginning the preliminary design phase for the light rail extension, which will give much greater clarity to how rail and trail can cross SR 520. An undercrossing would likely have the least grade change, but its feasibility depends at least in part in how rail is crossing the interchange. Staff recommends keeping options open as Sound Transit’s design process progresses.
			EXHIBIT C: Recommended Zoning Code Amendments	
14.	Page 3/43 Comment	Propose answering this as a comment – will review.	Either the legend or the map is confusing. The entire subarea is shown as Future Street Network, making it impossible to determine the difference between what is there now and what is proposed.	

## Attachment B – Marymoor Subarea: Draft Responses to Commissioner’s Questions

15.	9/43 (applies to all MDD areas)	Propose answering this as a question.	<p>Why are we sticking with mid 1960’s notions of minimum and maximum parking requirements for multi-family housing?</p> <p>Why are we not – in a transit oriented development area, of all places –uncoupling the parking space from the rental unit?</p>	<p>This response also addresses the parking component of #4 and question #25.</p> <p>City code permits deviations from the minimum and maximum parking code with the completion of a parking study that is reviewed by City staff. Many Downtown development projects have received permission to reduce parking ratios through this mechanism, often with implementation of a Transportation Management Plan (TMP). One tool that the City uses to gauge appropriate parking ratios is the King County Right Size Parking Calculator. This tool has the advantage of estimating actual demand based on a variety of conditions that the user can set. One limitation of the tool is that it is based on data from a particular point in time, and so over time may not capture broad trends in parking and travel behavior.</p> <p>Parking stalls in new multifamily developments in Downtown are offered and paid for separately from the unit, typically at \$75-\$100 per space. The majority of new buildings have an average of less than one parking space per unit.</p> <p>Regarding Heartland’s assumptions about parking costs (item #4), City staff did not ask Heartland to run different scenarios with different parking provisions. Experience in Downtown suggests that developers will seek parking reductions in conjunction with a parking study as the land use and transportation environment evolves over time, including with the introduction of light rail. This may reduce the capital and ongoing management costs of parking, and may</p>
-----	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--	---

## Attachment B – Marymoor Subarea: Draft Responses to Commissioner’s Questions

				<p>result in the introduction of different housing product types over time.</p> <p>Parking requirements for new development evolve over time to address changing market conditions. The most recent 2014 parking study conducted for the City did not provide clear consensus for changing the City’s parking regulations at that time. With the recent passage of ST3, with light rail to come to Southeast Redmond and Downtown, we will be undertaking a new citywide analysis of current parking standards and use. The results of such work will be shared with Planning Commission and City Council and may result in recommended changes to the parking code.</p>
16.	Page 24/43	Propose combining with answer in item #14 above.	Map – same comment on street base as Page 3	
17.	Page 28/43	Propose answering this as a comment – will review.	<p>Map –</p> <p>As a functional map describing the application of policy, it is necessary to account for all street frontages in the Vehicle Access map, even if the classification is “no restrictions whatsoever”. Add a classification if necessary, but please remove the vagueness and guesswork from the map.</p> <p>ALSO, has this map evolved from the Committee report in that now there is no classification sought at all on the frontage of the City-identified 1400 stall parking garage?</p>	

## Attachment B – Marymoor Subarea: Draft Responses to Commissioner’s Questions

18.	Page 29/43	Staff will follow-up with Parks staff and respond	Table 21.13.130A – MDD2. Yes to requiring ELST access on block faces abutting the trail, with the caveat that regional trails have (or in King County should have) slightly more stringent access requirements than seen on, say, the RCC. Does the City intend to treat access to the regional trail network differently than their local trail network?	
19.	Page 30/43	PEDESTRIAN-ORIENTED LAND USES: Propose for issues matrix	What is the rationale for not having pedestrian supportive land uses on the west side of 173 <sup>rd</sup> , knowing that this (if the 1400 stall parking garage is developed) will become THE MOST HEAVILY WALKED STREET in the Subarea? Do transit riders not count as pedestrians?	
			Marymoor Subarea Exhibit A: Recommended Land Use Transition Strategy	
20.	Comment Page 1	INFRASTRUCTURE: Propose for issues matrix	Question of PACE – the language anticipates and describes an “adapt as you go approach”, but does not address newly changed conditions, notably the adoption of and accelerated pace of Link LRT development to the area. This is not in reference to investment thresholds for design and setbacks (I’m fine with that), but rather to the public investment needed to enable the mixed use and residential goals of the plan. How does the plan address the pace of infrastructure development?	Staff want to clarify that the Committee’s report and its exhibits were subsequently updated by the Technical Committee’s report and its exhibits. Some information was preliminary draft as show in the Committee’s exhibits.

## Attachment B – Marymoor Subarea: Draft Responses to Commissioner’s Questions

21.	Page 3	INFRASTRUCTURE: Propose for issues matrix	Neighborhoods Element – “using development incentives <b>and other tools</b> to encourage the transition and achieve public goods such public parks and plazas”  Does the policy propose to only use incentives to achieve the performance levels necessary in public infrastructure to support the activities envisioned in this plan?	
22.	Page 4 See page 3 of Comp Plan Amendments	INFRASTRUCTURE: Propose for issues matrix	<del>N-SE-46 – Plan for a grade-separated crossing over Redmond Way near the station area to provide better non-motorized access to the station from the NE</del>  Please explain how this policy was derived. Isn’t this a topic initiated and addressed in PARCC and TMP planning efforts? How is it possible for a Subarea plan to make such specific determinations of design on regionally significant facilities? Don’t the folks in the rest of SE Redmond have a legitimate interest in this topic?	
23.	Page 3	PARK & RIDE GARAGE: Propose for issues matrix	Exhibit F – draft zoning regulations – The purpose of the MDD1 zone is to provide transit-oriented housing and employment <u>adjacent to</u> and <u>integrated with</u> the planned light rail station.  How does creating a 1400 stall parking garage 500 feet from the station accomplish this goal or meets the intent of the MDD policy listed above?	

## Attachment B – Marymoor Subarea: Draft Responses to Commissioner’s Questions

24.	Edit	Propose looking at this section	“locally-oriented goods” – please use “convenience retail” as normal language	Staff reviewed 21.13.110.A MDD5 Purpose that references locally-oriented goods. The use of the this term in intended to describe regulatory support for the creation of businesses providing General Sales or Services (Table 21.04.030C, Technical Report, Exhibit C1, pgs 8-12) in design district MDD5. Convenience store (retail) is one of the uses that would be permitted. Several other uses such as health and personal care, finance and insurance, and restaurants could also be established to provide locally-oriented access to goods and services to support residents and employees within the area. Staff recommends maintaining the generalized term for addressing the broad range of allowed uses.
25.	Page 4/35	Please refer to question #4.	Parking minimums appear simply too high for a transit oriented community. We’ve discussed on PC the prospects of uncoupling parking out of single unit rents and reducing the overall parking dedication. This makes even MORE sense here than in Downtown. <u>Why is this not being considered?</u> This is an issue throughout the section on MDD 1-5.	
26.	Page 5/35	Propose answering this as a question.	What is the rationale for not allowing a rapid charge station (assuming for e-cars) adjacent to a residential area? Please clarify language if intent is different. If the intent is to govern rapid recharge of transit vehicles, how does this policy align with King County Metro’s decision to acquire 200 all electric buses and especially their long term vision of a zero-emission transit fleet?	Table 21.04.030B and Table 21.04.030C, Technical Report, Exhibit C1, pages 5 and 10 include support for rapid charging stations in MDD1, 2, 4, and 5 zones. The MDD3 zone was previously adopted with the Southeast Redmond neighborhood plan in 2014 and a development has been initiated and will comprise the entirety of this zone. No additional changes were proposed for MDD3 because of the development status.

## Attachment B – Marymoor Subarea: Draft Responses to Commissioner’s Questions

27.	Page 11/35	Comment on proposed Zoning Code - Propose answering this as a question.	Rail Transportation – this sentence is unnecessarily vague – is the goal here to constrain Sound Transit operations? Not sure the City can dictate these terms to a regional entity, or those sanctioned by FTA/FRA. Please clarify and justify the policy.	This sentence is found in proposed regulations for MDD4. Sound Transit is not expected to be operating in MDD4. In addition, the light rail system is considered “Road, Ground Passenger, and Transit Transportation” in the Redmond Zoning Code. The purpose of this sentence is to reduce potential negative impacts from uses in <u>new structures</u> (not businesses in existing structure) as one way of achieving use compatibility.
28.	Page 21/35	Staff will review. The intent is that the map reflect what is planned for the future.	Marymoor Subarea Vehicle Access map 13.x – Very confusing, shouldn’t all street frontages be classified when the options on the map are “limited” and “permitted”? Both 67 <sup>th</sup> and 68 <sup>th</sup> Streets are areas requiring pedestrian supportive land use, but frontages are treated very differently and/or inconsistently. Is this perhaps more a reflection of what’s on the ground today rather than what is planned for the future?	
29.	Page 23/35	PARK & RIDE GARAGE: Propose for issues matrix along with the comment #17 above.	Pedestrian oriented block faces – map 13.# Again, very confusing and not particularly consistent with map 13.x above. The note regarding only requiring pedestrian frontage if a 1400 stall parking structure is developed needs explanation.	
30.	Page 31/35	Propose noting this as a comment.	MDD Design Standards (21.13) Intent. <i>“Several MDD zones (1,4,5) share a border with Marymoor Park. Development on properties along this border should take advantage of Marymoor Park as a visual and recreational amenity, and should avoid creating or maintaining a wall between Marymoor Park and the Design District.</i> TOTALLY AGREE	

## Attachment B – Marymoor Subarea: Draft Responses to Commissioner’s Questions

31.	COMMENT	PARK & RIDE GARAGE: Propose for issues matrix	1400 Stall Parking Garage Impacts on Marymoor Velodrome How does building a 1400 stall parking garage 100 feet from the racing surface at the Velodrome in any way support or reflect the language of 21.13? Has the Marymoor Velodrome Association ever been contacted regarding the City’s desire to do just that?	
32.	Page 31/35	PARK & RIDE GARAGE: Propose for issues matrix	<i>“...buildings shall be designed to take advantage of the park as a visual amenity, such as by placing large windows onto the park.</i>  Are these large windows very useful in a 1400 stall parking garage?	
33.	Page 31/35	Propose answering this as a question.  Staff is working on this question.	<i>Kiosks and drive through stands should be designed for access and enjoyment by those arriving on foot, bicycle or by car.</i>  Please provide a current example in Redmond of how a drive-in or drive-through anything can be specifically designed for access and enjoyment by people riding bicycles.	
34.	GENERAL COMMENT	PARK & RIDE GARAGE: Propose for issues matrix	Has KCP and ST agreed on a paid parking proposal to support special events at Marymoor Park? Have they discussed such a proposal? If so, was this a factor in the City preference to put the 1400 stall parking garage in a non-optimal location for transit users?	

## Attachment B – Marymoor Subarea: Draft Responses to Commissioner’s Questions

35.	GENERAL COMMENT	PARK & RIDE GARAGE: Propose for issues matrix	<p>The Infrastructure Report clearly provides a different vision for where the 1400 stall parking garage is to be located, and it conflicts with the vision presented by Sound Transit. Not surprisingly, ST envisioned the 1400 stall parking garage to be located as close to the Link station as possible for the (somewhat obvious) purpose of minimizing pedestrian transfer distance from car to train.</p> <p>Why does the City disagree with the ST preferred location?</p> <p>What were the criteria and/or planning criteria used to justify the location of the 1400 stall parking garage 500’away from the station?</p> <p>What other examples were used by the City to justify this proposal?</p> <p>How does the City justify the point blank conflict between the proposed facility location to protect the park and the policy direction to create a walkable neighborhood? <b>MAJOR ISSUE</b></p>	
-----	-----------------	---	--	--

## Attachment B – Marymoor Subarea: Draft Responses to Commissioner’s Questions

36.	GENERAL COMMENT	PARK & RIDE GARAGE: Propose for issues matrix	<p>Similarly, a design decision was made (as explained in the Infrastructure Report) to move the City proposed location for the 1400 stall parking garage further west in the MDD to avoid creating queuing backups on SR 202.</p> <p>Can the City demonstrate with tangible and comparable examples other locations in the Central Puget Sound Region where this is a legitimate issue? Why are we planning for “peak of the peak” impacts? What is the foreseeable impact on the walkability of MDD1 and 2 of forcing 3,000+ trips every weekday through the middle of our pedestrian district, our <i>“Activity Hub”, Innovation Zone”, “Gathering Spot” and “Park-Side Living and Working Area?”</i></p> <p>What other locations were considered and why were they eliminated?</p>	
37.	GENERAL COMMENT	<p>Propose answering this as a question</p> <p>Staff is working on this question</p>	<p>Roundabout Design – The Infrastructure Report (which appears to be the foundation for many Comp Plan, Functional Plan, and Zoning Code amendments) presents a concept for a major “rotary” scale intersection into which trail traffic on the ELST must pass through.</p> <p>What is the status of this design proposal in the context of the material presented to the PC?</p> <p>What design guidance is cited to justify routing a regional trail at grade through a roundabout?</p> <p>What feedback has been received from transportation planning staff regarding this concept?</p>	

## Attachment B – Marymoor Subarea: Draft Responses to Commissioner’s Questions

38.	GENERAL COMMENT	<p>Propose answering this as a question with item #1 above.</p> <p>This question was answered during the Commission’s 1/18 study session.</p>	<p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>How long do MFE tax exemptions last?</p> <p>What is the level of subsidy (in USD\$) provided, per unit?</p> <p>Are we considering target populations for affordable housing, i.e. Seniors, artists, etc.?</p> <p>Are we considering a baseline of a percentage of permanently affordable housing?</p> <p>Are there any active proposals (i.e. in discussion with the City) for this subarea?</p>	
39.	GENERAL COMMENT	<p>INFRASTRUCTURE: Propose for issues matrix</p>	<p>Utility systems</p> <p>To what degree can the natural drainage infrastructure proposed for the subarea be built piece by piece as opposed to systemically?</p> <p>Are there efficiencies that accrue to the public by developing this as a system?</p> <p>Does funding this utility development “as market forces determine” undermine efforts to take advantages of economies of scale in redeveloping public infrastructure?</p>	